

⁴ Magistrate Judge Steger specifically advised Plaintiff that she had 14 days in which to object to the Report and Recommendation and that failure to do so would waive her right to appeal. (Doc. 6 at 6 n.3); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see also* *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 148-51 (1985) (noting that “[i]t does not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to those findings”). Even taking into account the three additional days for service provided by Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d), the period in which Plaintiff could timely file any objections has now expired.

Recommendation, as well as the record, and it agrees with Magistrate Judge Steger's well-reasoned conclusions.

Accordingly,

- The Court **ACCEPTS** and **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Steger's findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations (Doc. 6);
- Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*, (Doc. 4), is hereby **DENIED AS MOOT**; and
- Plaintiff's Complaint, (Doc. 1), is hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

SO ORDERED this 1st day of June, 2017.

/s/ Harry S. Mattice, Jr.
HARRY S. MATTICE, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE